UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,267	12/03/2001	Alain Jean Falys	448/9-1621	2061

7590   10/05/2006

William J. Sapone, Esq.
Coleman Sudol Supone
714 Colorado Avenue
Bridgeport, CT   06605-1601

EXAMINER
CHANDLER, SARA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3693	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/006,267	FALYS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sara Chandler	3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 December 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/01/02, 08/12/02</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 04/01/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR

1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each

non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other

information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the

application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. In

particular, a legible copy of EP 0 909 108 A2 has not been provided.

Claim Objections

The claims objected to because of the following informalities: The claims are

misnumbered. There is no claim 16 and two claim 41's. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,3,8,9,10,12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Hamlin, EP 0 928 090 A2.

Re Claim 1:   Hamlin discloses a communication routing apparatus comprising:-

input transmission line means (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11,

line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56);

output transmission line means (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col.

11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56);

input processing means for processing signals received from the input

transmission line means into an intermediate form having predetermined

characteristics, the processing of each signal being dependent on its source (Hamlin,

col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45-

56);

output processing means for processing signals in said intermediate form,

produced by the input processing means, into signals in selected forms, the

processing of each signal being dependent on its destination (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-

28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56); and

transmission means for transmitting signals, produced by the output

processing means, via the output transmission line means to their destinations

(Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12,

line 45- 56).

Re Claim 2:   Hamlin discloses an apparatus, including means storing a plurality of

input signal processing mapping definitions, wherein the input processing means is

configured to select an input signal processing mapping definition in dependence on

the source of the signal being processed and process said signal according to the

selected input signal processing mapping definition to convert said signal into said

intermediate form (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11,

line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 3:   Hamlin discloses apparatus, including means storing a plurality of

output signal processing mapping definitions, wherein the output processing means

is configured to select an output signal processing mapping definition in

dependence on the destination of the signal being processed and process said signal

according to the selected output signal processing mapping definition to convert

said signal into the form required according to its destination (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-

28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 8:   Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the output signal processing

means is adapted o obtain a signal destination id from each intermediate form   signal

being processed and select the appropriate output mapping definition in dependence

thereon (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58;

col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 9: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the output signal processing

means is configured to send its output signals to buffer means selected in

dependence on the destinations thereof (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -

col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

  Re Claim 10: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is

configured to apply the selected input mapping definitions to perform data format

conversions on data represented by said received signals (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28;

col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

  Re Claim 12: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the output processing means is

configured to apply the selected output mapping definitions to perform data format

conversions on data represented by said intermediate form signals (Hamlin, col. 3, lines

16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 13:   Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the input and output signals

represent data files (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11,

line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
       obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hamlin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Baudoin, US Pat. No.

5,406,557.

Re Claim 4:   Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, including storage means

for storing signals produced by the input processing means, wherein the output

processing means reads signals in said intermediate form from the storage means

before processing them. Baudoin discloses an apparatus, including storage means for

storing signals produced by the input processing means, wherein the output processing

means reads signals in said intermediate form from the storage means before

processing them (Baudoin, col. 3, lines 20-49; col. 4 , lines 22-45; col. 6, lines 45+ -col.

7, line 7; Tables 2,3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the

teachings of Baudoin to provide an apparatus, including storage means for storing

signals produced by the input processing means, wherein the output processing

means reads signals in said intermediate form from the storage means before

processing them. As suggested by Baudoin, one would have been motivated to have

sufficient memory and speed to handle the tasks required.

Re Claim 5: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, including storage means

for storing signals, received by the input processing means, so as to maintain a record

of received signals. Baudoin discloses an apparatus, including storage means for

storing signals, received by the input processing means, so as to maintain a record of

received signals (Baudoin, col. 3, lines 20-49; col. 4 , lines 22-45; col. 6, lines 45+ -col.

7, line 7; Tables 2,3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the

teachings of Baudoin to provide an apparatus, including storage means for storing

signals, received by the input processing means, so as to maintain a record of received

signals. As suggested by Baudoin, one would have been motivated to have sufficient

memory and speed to handle the tasks required.

Claims 6,7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pasetes, US Pat. No. 5,202,977.

Re Claim 6: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is adapted to determine the source of a received signal from a buffer location from which it is taken for processing and select the appropriate input mapping definition in dependence thereon. Pasetes discloses an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is adapted to determine the source of a received signal from a buffer location from which it is taken for processing and select the appropriate input mapping definition in dependence thereon (Pasetes, col. 7, lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12, line 65+ -col. 13, line 30; col. 16, lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col. 284, line 34; col. 286, line 18 – line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is adapted to determine the source of a received signal from a buffer location from which it is taken for processing and select the appropriate input mapping definition in dependence thereon. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 7: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is adapted to produce a plurality of signals in said intermediate form from a received signal comprising one transmission session. Pasetes discloses an

apparatus, wherein the input processing means is adapted to produce a plurality of

signals in said intermediate form from a received signal comprising one transmission

session (Pasetes, col. 7, lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12, line65+

-col. 13, line 30; col. 16, lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col. 284, line

34; col. 286, line 18 – line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting

the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the input processing means

is adapted to produce a plurality of signals in said intermediate form from a received

signal comprising one transmission session. As suggested by Pasetes one would have

been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more

direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 11: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the input

processing means is configured to add data to that represented by said received

signals. Pasetes discloses an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is

configured to add data to that represented by said received signals (Pasetes, col. 7,

lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12, line65+ -col. 13, line 30; col. 16,

lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col. 284, line 34; col. 286, line 18 –

line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of

Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is configured to

add data to that represented by said received signals. As suggested by Pasetes one

would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified

and more direct communication and data integration.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hamlin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coleman, US Pat. No.

5,708,828.

Re Claim 14:   Hamlin fails to explicitly discloses an apparatus, wherein the

intermediate format signals represent data in tables of a database. Coleman discloses

an apparatus, wherein the intermediate format signals represent data in tables of a

database (Coleman, abstract; col. 2, line 48-66; col. 3, line 42-57; col. 6, line 26-33; col.

6, line 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-14; col. 7, lines 35-44). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of

Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Coleman to provide an apparatus, wherein the

intermediate format signals represent data in tables of a database. As suggested by

Coleman, one would have been motivated to allow for multiple data base conversions to

be created easily and efficiently.

 Re Claim 15:   Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein each table

comprises data from a plurality of input signals and each input signal provides data for a

plurality of tables of said database. Coleman discloses an apparatus, wherein each

table comprises data from a plurality of input signals and each input signal provides

data for a plurality of tables of said database (Coleman, abstract; col. 2, line 48-66; col.

3, line 42-57; col. 6, line 26-33; col. 6, line 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-14; col. 7, lines 35-44). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Coleman to

provide an apparatus, wherein each table comprises data from a plurality of input

signals and each input signal provides data for a plurality of tables of said database. As

suggested by Coleman, one would have been motivated to allow for multiple data base

conversions to be created easily and efficiently.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin

as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hughes-Hartog, 5495485..

Re Claim 17: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, configured to process

signal in layer 7 of the OSI networking reference model. Hughes-Hartog discloses an

apparatus, configured to process signal in layer 7 of the OSI networking reference

model (Hughes-Hartog, abstract; Fig. 1; col. 1; lines 10-15; col. 1, line 55+ -col. 2, line 9;

col. 3, line 29+ -col. 4; line 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings Hamlin by adopting the

teachings of Hughes- Hartog to provide an apparatus, configured to process signal in

layer 7 of the OSI networking reference model. As suggested by Hughes-Hartog, one

would have been motivated to comply with international standards for related to

communication.

Claims 18, 19, 20,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,33,34,35,38, 39, 40,41(1), 41(2), 43

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin, EP 0928090 in

view of Pasetes, US Pat. No. 5,202,977.

Re Claim 18: Hamlin discloses a routing apparatus comprising:

receiving means for receiving data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -

col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56);

input processing means for processing received data into an intermediate

form having predetermined characteristics, the processing of the data being

dependent on the identity of the data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col.

11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56);

output processing means for data in said intermediate form, produced by

the input processing means, into data in selected forms, the processing of

data in said intermediate form being dependent on the identity of the party receiving

the data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58;

col. 12, line 45- 56); and

transmission means for transmitting data, produced by the output

processing means their destinations (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col.

11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice.

Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34;

col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to

provide an invoice routing apparatus comprising: receiving means for receiving

invoices; input processing means for processing received invoices into an intermediate

form having predetermined characteristics, the processing of each invoice being

dependent on the identity of the raiser of the invoice; output processing means for

invoices in said intermediate form, produced by the input processing means, into

invoices in selected forms, the processing of invoice in said intermediate form being

dependent on the identity of the party being invoiced; and transmission means for

transmitting invoices, produced by the output processing means their destinations.

As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy,

cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data

integration.

Re Claim 19: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, including means storing a plurality of

input data mapping definitions, wherein the input processing means is

configured to select an input data mapping definition in dependence on identifier of the

data being processed and process said data according to the selected input data

mapping definition to convert said data into said intermediate form (Hamlin, col. 3, lines

16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin

fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the

data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col.

16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by

adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, including means storing a

plurality of input invoice mapping definitions, wherein the input processing means is

configured to select an input invoice mapping definition in dependence on the raiser of

the invoice being processed and process said invoice according to the selected input

invoice mapping definition to convert said invoice into said intermediate form. As

suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost

reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 20:   Hamlin discloses an apparatus, including means storing a plurality of

output data mapping definitions, wherein the output processing means is

configured to select an output data mapping definition in dependence on the

party receiving the data and process said data according to the selected output

data mapping definition to convert said signal into the form required by the party

receiving the data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11,

line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an

invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34;

col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an

apparatus, including means storing a plurality of output invoice mapping definitions,

wherein the output processing means is configured to select an output invoice mapping

definition in dependence on the party being invoiced and process said invoice according

to the selected output invoice mapping definition to convert said signal into the form

required by the party being invoiced. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been

motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct

communication and data integration.

Re Claim 23: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the input

processing means is adapted to determine the source of a received invoice

from a buffer location from which it is taken for processing and select the

appropriate input invoice mapping definition in dependence thereon. Pasetes

discloses an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is adapted to

determine the source of a received invoice from a buffer location from which

it is taken for processing and select the appropriate input invoice mapping

definition in dependence thereon (Pasetes, col. 7, lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9,

line 23-59; col. 12, line65+ -col. 13, line 30; col. 16, lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col.

283, line 40+ - col. 284, line 34; col. 286, line 18 – line 28). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus,

wherein the input processing means is adapted to determine the source of a

received invoice from a buffer location from which it is taken for processing

and select the appropriate input invoice mapping definition in dependence

thereon. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed,

accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and

data integration.

Re Claim 24: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the input

processing means is adapted to produce a plurality of invoices in said intermediate

form from a collection of invoices received together. Pasetes discloses an apparatus

according to claim 23, wherein the input processing means is adapted to produce a

plurality of invoices in said intermediate form from a collection of invoices received

together (Pasetes, col. 7, lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12, line65+

-col. 13, line 30; col. 16, lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col. 284, line

34; col. 286, line 18 – line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting

the teaching of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is

adapted to produce a plurality of invoices in said intermediate form from a collection of

invoices received together. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated

by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct

communication and data integration.

Re Claim 25: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the output processing means is

adapted to obtain a data destination id from each intermediate form of data

being processed and select the appropriate output data mapping definition in

dependence thereon (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col.

11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is

an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-

34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an

apparatus, wherein the output processing means is adapted to obtain an invoice

destination id from each intermediate form invoice being processed and select the

appropriate output invoice mapping definition in dependence thereon. As suggested by

Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 26: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the output processing means is configured to send its output data to buffer means selected in dependence on the destinations thereof (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the output processing means is configured to send its output invoices to buffer means selected in dependence on the destinations thereof. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 27: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is configured to apply the selected input data definitions to perform data format conversions on data represented by said received signals (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by

adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the input

processing means is configured to apply the selected input invoice mapping definitions

to perform data format conversions on data represented by said received signals. As

suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost

reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 28:   Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the input

processing means is configured to add data to that represented by said received

invoices. Pasetes discloses an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is

configured to add data to that represented by said received invoices (Pasetes, col. 7,

lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12, line65+ -col. 13, line 30; col. 16,

lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col. 284, line 34; col. 286, line 18 –

line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of

Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the input processing means is configured to

add data to that represented by said received invoices. As suggested by Pasetes one

would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified

and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 29:   Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the output processing means is

configured to apply the selected output data mapping definitions to perform data format

conversions on intermediate form invoices (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -

col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose

wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice

(Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an apparatus, wherein the output processing means is configured to apply the selected output invoice mapping definitions to perform data format conversions on intermediate form invoices. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 30: Hamlin discloses an apparatus, wherein the received and transmitted data is represented by data files (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes provide an apparatus, wherein the received and transmitted invoices are represented by data files. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 33: Hamlin discloses an invoice routing method comprising:-
receiving data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56);

electronically processing said received data into an intermediate form having

predetermined characteristics in dependence on the identity of the data

(Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12,

line 45- 56);

electronically processing said intermediate form data into data in a form

selected in dependence on the identity of the data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10,

line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56); and sending data in said

selected form to its destination (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line

3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes

discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15;

col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide an invoice

routing method comprising: receiving an invoice; electronically processing said received

invoice into an intermediate form having predetermined characteristics in dependence

on the identity of the raiser of the invoice; electronically processing said

intermediate form invoice into an invoice in a form selected in dependence on the

identity of the party being invoiced; and sending said invoice in said selected for to its

destination. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed,

accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and

data integration.

Re Claim 34:   Hamlin discloses a method, including storing a plurality of input data

mapping definitions and selecting a data mapping definition from said

stored input data mapping definition for use in said electronic processing of said

received data in dependence on identifier of the data (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col.

10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes

discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15;

col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

teachings of Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide a method,

including storing a plurality of input invoice mapping definitions and selecting an invoice

mapping definition from said stored input invoice mapping definition for use in said

electronic processing of said received invoice in dependence on the raiser of said

invoice. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy,

cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data

integration.

Re Claim 35: Hamlin discloses a method, including storing a plurality of output

data mapping definitions and selecting an output data mapping definition from

said stored output data mapping definitions for using in said electronic

processing of said received data in dependence on the party receiving the data (Hamlin,

col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45-

56). Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses

wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines

18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of

Hamlin by adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide a method, including storing a

plurality of output invoice mapping definitions and selecting an output invoice

mapping definition from said stored output invoice mapping definitions for using

in said electronic processing of said received invoice in dependence on the party

being invoiced. As suggested by Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed,

accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more direct communication and

data integration.

Re Claim 38: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose a method, wherein the processing of

said received invoice comprises determining the source of said received invoice from a

buffer location from which it is taken for processing and selecting the appropriate input

invoice mapping definition in dependence thereon. Pasetes discloses a method,

wherein the processing of said received invoice comprises determining the source of

said received invoice from a buffer location from which it is taken for processing and

selecting the appropriate input invoice mapping definition in dependence thereon

(Pasetes, col. 7, lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12, line65+ -col. 13,

line 30; col. 16, lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col. 284, line 34; col.

286, line 18 – line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hamlin by adopting the

teachings of Pasetes to provide a method, wherein the processing of said received

invoice comprises determining the source of said received invoice from a buffer location

from which it is taken for processing and selecting the appropriate input invoice

mapping definition in dependence thereon. As suggested by Pasetes one would have

been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction, productivity, simplified and more

direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 39: Hamlin discloses a method, wherein the processing of said intermediate

form invoice comprises obtaining an invoice destination id therefrom and selecting the

appropriate output invoice mapping definition in dependence thereon (Hamlin, col. 3,

lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 40: Hamlin discloses a method, wherein the output processing means is

configured to send its output invoices to buffer means selected in dependence on

 the destinations thereof (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3;

col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 41(1): Hamlin discloses a method, wherein the processing of said received

invoice comprises apply the selected input invoice mapping definitions to perform data

format conversion on said received invoice (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+

-col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 41(2): Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose a method, wherein the processing of

said received invoice includes adding data to said received invoice. Pasetes discloses

a method, wherein the processing of said received invoice includes adding data to said

received invoice (Pasetes, col. 7, lines 5-9; col. 7, lines 37-46; col. 9, line 23-59; col. 12,

line65+ -col. 13, line 30; col. 16, lines 33-43; col. 24, line 13-29; col. 283, line 40+ - col.

284, line 34; col. 286, line 18 – line 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Hamlin by

adopting the teachings of Pasetes to provide a method, wherein the processing of said

received invoice includes adding data to said received invoice. As suggested by

Pasetes one would have been motivated by speed, accuracy, cost reduction,

productivity, simplified and more direct communication and data integration.

Re Claim 42: Hamlin discloses a method, wherein the processing of said intermediate

form invoice comprises applying the selected output invoice mapping definition to

perform data format conversions on said intermediate form invoice (Hamlin, col. 3, lines

16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col. 11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Re Claim 43: Hamlin discloses a method, wherein the received and transmitted

invoices are represented by data files (Hamlin, col. 3, lines 16-28; col. 10, line 57+ -col.

11, line 3; col. 11, line 37-58; col. 12, line 45- 56).

Claims 21,22,36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hamlin and Pasetes as applied to claims 18 and 33 above, and

further in view of Baudoin, US Pat. No. 5,406,557.

Re Claim 21: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, including storage

means for storing intermediate form invoices produced by the input processing means,

wherein the output processing means reads invoices in said intermediate form from the

storage means before processing them. Baudoin discloses an apparatus, including

storage means for storing intermediate form data produced by the input processing

means, wherein the output processing means reads data in said intermediate form from

the storage means before processing them (Baudoin, col. 3, lines 20-49; col. 4 , lines

22-45; col. 6, lines 45+ -col. 7, line 7; Tables 2,3). Baudoin fails to explicitly disclose

wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice

(Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43;

col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and Baudoin

to provide an apparatus, including storage means for storing intermediate form invoices

produced by the input processing means, wherein the output processing means reads

invoices in said intermediate form from the storage means before processing them. As

suggested by Baudoin, one would have been motivated to have sufficient memory and

speed to handle the tasks required.

Re Claim 22: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, including storage means

for storing invoices, received by the input processing means, so as to maintain a record

of received invoices. Baudoin discloses an apparatus, including storage means for

storing data, received by the input processing means, so as to maintain a record of

received data (Baudoin, col. 3, lines 20-49; col. 4 , lines 22-45; col. 6, lines 45+ -col. 7,

line 7; Tables 2,3). Baudoin fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice.

Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4,

line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and Baudoin to provide an apparatus,

including storage means for storing invoices, received by the input processing means,

so as to maintain a record of received invoices. As suggested by Baudoin, one would

have been motivated to have sufficient memory and speed to handle the tasks required.

   Re Claim 36:   Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose a method, storing said intermediate

form invoice and reading said intermediate form invoice from where it has been stored

before processing it into said selected form. Baudoin discloses a method, storing said

intermediate form data and reading said intermediate form data from where it has been

stored before processing it into said selected form (Baudoin, col. 3, lines 20-49; col. 4 ,

lines 22-45; col. 6, lines 45+ -col. 7, line 7; Tables 2,3). Baudoin fails to explicitly

disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an

invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines

33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and

Baudoin to provide a method, storing said intermediate form invoice and reading said

intermediate form invoice from where it has been stored before processing it into said

selected form. As suggested by Baudoin, one would have been motivated to have

sufficient memory and speed to handle the tasks required.

   Re Claim 37:   Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose a method, storing said invoice as

received in a received invoice archive. Baudoin discloses a method, storing said data

as received in a received data archive (Baudoin, col. 3, lines 20-49; col. 4 , lines 22-45;

col. 6, lines 45+ -col. 7, line 7; Tables 2,3). Baudoin fails to explicitly disclose wherein

the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col.

1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-

51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and Baudoin to provide a method, storing said invoice as received in a received invoice archive. As suggested by Baudoin, one would have been motivated to have sufficient memory and speed to handle the tasks required.

Claims 31,32,44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin and Pasetes as applied to claims 18 and 33 above, and further in view of Coleman, US Pat. No. 5,708,828.

Re Claim 31: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein the intermediate form invoices are represented by data in tables of a database. Coleman discloses an apparatus, wherein the intermediate form data is represented by data in tables of a database (Coleman, abstract; col. 2, line 48-66; col. 3, line 42-57; col. 6, line 26-33; col. 6, line 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-14; col. 7, lines 35-44). Coleman fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and Coleman to provide an apparatus, wherein the intermediate form invoices are represented by data in tables of a database. As suggested by Coleman, one would have been motivated to allow for multiple data base conversions to be created easily and efficiently.

Re Claim 32: Hamlin fails to explicitly disclose an apparatus, wherein each table

comprises data from a plurality of input signals and each input signal provides data for

a plurality of tables of said database. Coleman discloses an apparatus, wherein each

table comprises data from a plurality of input signals and each input signal provides

data for a plurality of tables of said database (Coleman, abstract; col. 2, line 48-66; col.

3, line 42-57; col. 6, line 26-33; col. 6, line 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-14; col. 7, lines 35-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and Coleman to provide an

apparatus, wherein each table comprises data from a plurality of input signals and each

input signal provides data for a plurality of tables of said database. As suggested by

Coleman, one would have been motivated to allow for multiple data base conversions to

be created easily and efficiently.

Re Claim 44: Hamlin discloses a method, wherein said intermediate form invoice

comprises data in tables of a database. Coleman discloses a method, wherein said

intermediate form data comprises data in tables of a database (Coleman, abstract; col.

2, line 48-66; col. 3, line 42-57; col. 6, line 26-33; col. 6, line 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-14;

col. 7, lines 35-44). Coleman fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice.

Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4,

line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the teachings of Hamlin, Pasetes and Coleman to provide a method, wherein

said intermediate form invoice comprises data in tables of a database. As suggested by

Coleman, one would have been motivated to allow for multiple data base conversions to be created easily and efficiently.

Re Claim 45: Hamlin discloses a method, wherein each table comprises data from a plurality of received invoices and received invoice provides data for a plurality of tables of said database. Coleman discloses a method, wherein each table comprises data from a plurality of received data and the received data provides data for a plurality of tables of said database (Coleman, abstract; col. 2, line 48-66; col. 3, line 42-57; col. 6, line 26-33; col. 6, line 58-67; col. 7, lines 1-14; col. 7, lines 35-44). Coleman fails to explicitly disclose wherein the data is an invoice. Pasetes discloses wherein the data is an invoice (Pasetes, col. 1, lines 12-34; col. 4, line 7-15; col. 8, lines 18-30; col. 16; lines 33-43; col. 20, lines 47-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method, wherein each table comprises data from a plurality of received invoices and received invoice provides data for a plurality of tables of said database. As suggested by Coleman, one would have been motivated to allow for multiple data base conversions to be created easily and efficiently.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Bennett, US Pub. No. 20020116334 - transmitting documents in different formats;.

Lech, US Pat. No. 6,094,505 - transmitting documents in different formats;

Lech, Us Pat. No. 5,768,416 - transmitting documents in different formats;

Lech, US Pat. No. 5,625,465 - transmitting documents in different formats;

Lech, US Pat. No. 5,369,508 - transmitting documents in different formats;

Lech, US Pat. No. 5,258,855 - transmitting documents in different formats;

Cheng-Hung, US Pat. No. 6,397,232 - transmitting documents in different formats;

Bowman-Amuah US Pub. No. 20030058277 - transmitting documents in different

formats; and

Schweitzer, US Pat. No. 6,418,467- transmitting documents in different formats.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sara Chandler whose telephone number is 571-272-

1186. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMC

JAGDISH N. PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER